

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 16-31, and 34-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, 35 and 36 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 19, 35 and 36 are amended. Claims 14-15 and 32-33 have been canceled. Claims 1-13, 16-31, and 34-36 stand rejected.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-13, 16-31 and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight (US 6,515,681) in view of Kanungo et al. (US 6,380,955). Knight relates to a program and graphical user interface for facilitating user interactions with an online message board system with a plurality of displayed regions. Kanungo et al. relates to a method and apparatus implementing a separate child context for regions of a display. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 19, 35 and 36 each recite “the element flagged by the user indicates the context for the alteration of information in regions not having a flagged element and the altering of information consists of altering information displayed in all of said plurality of regions, different from said first region, based upon said flagged element”. The office action seems to assert that this element is disclosed by the Knight reference in Col. 19, lines 35-67 and continuing in Col. 20, lines 1-67, however it does not. These sections of the Knight reference disclose a robust filtering system for locating, categorizing, and displaying data of interest to a user. The filters are selected and modified by a user, or by an automated filter management capability as disclosed. However, the filtering system only applies to those portions of the screen that are flagged for the display of this filtered information. As such, either the filtered content is displayed or not displayed, based upon the desire of the user. The filtering system of Knight does not teach or imply that such filtered data may alter “information in regions not having a flagged element” as is recited in the above claims.

The instant invention is one that provides a context for the generation and display of information throughout all display regions on that visual display. The claims provide for the modification of displayed data in regions even where there is no flagged element to provide a “yes/no” response for data display. This is very different from a filtering system, regardless of how well managed. Filtered data will only appear, as shown in the Knight reference, in the

display if the display flag for the filtered data is selected. Thus, if a region of the display has no flagged element to turn on the filtering system, no filtered data will be displayed in that region. This is not the same as the ability to display items that are generated in the context of a flagged element in one portion of the display and have the same context applied to a region of the display that has no flagged element at all. Therefore, the Knight reference does not teach or imply at least the above claim features from claims 1, 19, 35 and 36 and these claims are patentable over Knight for at least this reason.

The Kanungo et al reference does not remedy the shortcomings of the Knight reference. The office action admits that the Kanungo et al reference fails to “explicitly teach altering the information displayed in at least one region, different from said first region, based upon said flagged element”, Office Action, page 2. The Kanungo et al reference also fails to teach or imply that flagged data may alter “information in regions not having a flagged element”. The Kanungo et al reference discloses a parental locking mechanism to protect children against unseemly content that may be displayed on a web browser screen. As such, there is a contextual decision for the display of data based upon whether the parental control flag is set or not, or if there is some error condition that impairs the parental control system. However, this also is a context that is engaged by a flagging condition of some type. There is no teaching to support the contextual display of information in screen portions that have a flagged element and equally contextual display of information in another screen portion that has no flagged element as is recited in the claims above. Thus, the combination of Knight and Kanungo et al fails to provide the teachings needed to establish that claims 1, 19, 35 and 36 are obvious. These claims are allowable for at least the reasons given above. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 2-13, 16-18, 20-31 and 34, these claims each depend from one of independent claims 1 or 19. The combination of Knight and Kanungo et al fails to provide the teachings needed to establish that claims 1 and 19 are obvious, therefore the dependant claims are allowable for at least the reasons shown for claims 1 and 19. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3844/167533.03
Application No.: 10/803,381
Office Action Dated: June 22, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

Date: October 23, 2007

/Steven B. Samuels/
Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439